UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,625	08/25/2003	Nageshwar Aita	Aita 1-1-1-2-1-2 (LCNT/12	5323

46363 7590 05/29/2007

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER	
THERIAULT, STEVEN B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,625	AITA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven B. Theriault	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 03/14/2007.

This action is made Final.

2. Claims 1 -21 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 6 are the independent claims. It is noted to the Applicant that a new Examiner has been assigned to the case. Applicant's amendment necessitated the final rejection. Applicant's amendment to claim 1 applies to claims 1-5 and thus a new ground of rejection has been applied to the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pugaczewski et al. (hereinafter Pugaczewski) U.S. Patent No. 6,903,755 issued June 7, 2005 and filed Dec. 21, 1999.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1,** Pugaczewski teaches a method for provisioning a circuit via a plurality of network elements comprising:

- Graphically representing said network elements within a network (see Figures 20-29 and column 4, lines 5-67) Pugaczewski expressly shows a graphical representation of a network of elements.

- Graphically representing a communications link between two network elements as a bridge object disposed between two of said plurality of network element objects (See column 2, lines 35-41 and column 20, lines 40-47). Pugaczewski expressly shows a graphical representation of a cross connect where links are made between nodes on different networks.
- Graphically representing the status of cross-connection links within said network elements as an icon displayed on each of said linked network element objects wherein said network element objects and bridge objects may be manipulated by the user to form a graphical representation of the circuit being provisioned (See column 20, lines 5-67 and column 22, lines 8-25). Pugaczewski expressly shows icons of interconnected elements along with the color status of the provisioning of objects. The user can add a line or drop a line or connection between objects in the interface, which is a provisioning function.

With respect to **dependent claim 2,** Pugaczewski teaches a method wherein the icon is selected from the group consisting of a set of colors, a set of images, shapes symbols objects (See column 20, lines 9-59). Pugaczewski shows colors and images on the icons as shown in figure 23 along with a given shape for the node.

With respect to **dependent claim 3,** Pugaczewski teaches the method wherein the icon (See column 20, lines 19-47). Pugaczewski teaches a connection status is shown to the user in colors. Red is equivalent to unsuccessful connection and green is successful.

With respect to **dependent claim 5,** Pugaczewski teaches the method wherein each bridge object has at least one communications link each communications link comprising at least one channel for establishing a communication path between two of the plurality of network elements (See column 20, lines 49-57) where each link has a specific channel identifier and port. Each element in the window shows the cross connect information of each element.

5. **Claims 6 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dev et al. (Patent No. 5,559,955).**

As to **independent claim 6**, Dev et al. teaches:

A graphical user interface (GUI) (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), comprising: a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31; i.e., the plurality of network elements include bridges, routers, hubs, and cables), each network element object representing a respective element within a network (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 13, lines 17 – 20; i.e., local area networks and subnetworks are graphically represented) and having a status icon associated with the network element object (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58; i.e., background area 414 represents the status of the network device); a plurality of bridge objects (interconnections 346 – see e.g., Fig. 8B), representing a respective communications channel within the network (see e.g., col. 13, lines 28 – 31; i.e., interconnections 346 represent communication channels between network devices within a network); wherein: in response to a user selection of a network element object (see e.g., col. 4, lines 30 – 40; i.e., user interface 10 is user configurable, wherein the user is able to add new types of network devices), the network element corresponding to the selected network object is selected for use in a circuit (see e.g., col. 5, lines 29 – 31; provisioning a circuit board corresponds to Fig. 8A representing circuit boards, printed circuit board racks, bridges, routers, hubs, and cables); and its corresponding status icon displays information as to the status of a communications channel between the network element and a second network element (see e.g., Fig. 4B and col. 14, lines 56 – 58; i.e., the status of a network device is represented by different colors depicted by background area 414, wherein each background area 414 corresponds to an individual network device).

As to **dependent claim 7**, Dev et al. teaches:

The GUI of claim 6, wherein each bridge object (see e.g., Fig. 8B and col. 13, lines 30 – 31; i.e., the bridge object corresponds to interconnection 346, wherein interconnection 346 is used to

connect device icons) further comprises at least one communications link object (see e.g., Fig. 8B; i.e., multifunction icons 340, 342, and 344 have at least one communications link, wherein the communication link corresponds to interconnection 346), each communications link object comprising at least one channel object, each channel object representing the communication channel (see e.g., Fig. 8B; i.e., multifunction icon 344 comprises at least one channel, such as interconnection 346, for establishing a communication path between multifunction icon 342 and a "Hardware/Firmware Development Group" multifunction icon).

As to **dependent claim 8**, Dev et al. teaches:

The GUI of claim 6, wherein the status icon (see e.g., Fig. 9 and see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58; i.e., background area 414 of network device represents the status of the network device) is selected from the group (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 14, lines 32 – 37; i.e., the user is able to click on an icon, such as administration network icon 330, engineering network icon 332 and internet icon 334, from the group of icons) consisting of colors (see e.g., Fig. 9 and col. 14, lines 56 – 59; i.e., background area 414 can be represented in different colors, wherein the color is associated with the status of the network), shapes (see e.g., Fig. 9), symbols (see e.g., Fig. 9 and col. 14, lines 62 – 67; i.e., bar graph 406 and 408 are symbols representing performance information of the network device), objects (see e.g., Fig. 9) and text (see e.g., Fig. 9 and col. 14, line 52; i.e., area 402 is a text area for the device name).

As to **dependent claim 9**, Dev et al. teaches:

The GUI of claim 8, wherein the colors represent the status of a communications channel (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 57; i.e., background area 414 represents the status of the network device, wherein the background area 414 can be displayed in different colors) between the first network element and the second network element (see e.g., Fig. 8B and col. 10, lines 59 – 67; i.e., background area 414 represents the status of a communication channel, wherein each individual device icon represented in Fig. 8B comprises a background area 414, which corresponds to the communication channel status of multifunction icon 342 and 340).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pugaczewski et al. (hereinafter Pugaczewski) U.S. Patent No. 6,903,755 issued June 7, 2005 and filed Dec. 21, 1999, in view of Mayo et al. (hereinafter Mayo) U.S. Patent No. 5,751,965 issued May 12, 1998.**

With respect to **dependent claim 4,** as indicated in the above discussion, Pugaczewski teaches every element of claim 3.

Pugaczewski teaches the icons have a set of colors that represent states red, green yellow etc (see so, lines 5-67).

Pugaczewski teaches does not specifically mention a set of colors consist of a list of seven colors. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a network management

system that allows connections to be displayed in various colors. The colors indication the connection status and has list of seven colors (see e.g., Fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 45-50). Mayo and Pugaczewski are analogous art because they both provide for displaying network information in a format that the user is easily able to discern the network connections and configurations from the graphical constructs in the display.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of Mayo and Pugaczewski in front of them, to modify the system of Pugaczewski, which already displays three colors, to incorporate a larger set of colors for the purposes of each color corresponding to a particular connection state and cross-connection state within each network element. The motivation to combine Mayo with Pugaczewski comes from the suggestion in Mayo that network connections can be displayed as relationships on the display and the relationship icon has a color indicating the condition of the connection where different colors provides an advantage to the user (See column 7, lines 37-50).

8. **Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev et al. (Patent No. 5,559,955) in view of Tonelli et al. (Patent No. 5,831,610).**

As to **dependent claim 10**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), comprising: a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31; i.e., the plurality of network elements include bridges, routers, hubs, and cables), a first color representing a cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58; i.e., the status of the network device can be represented in different colors, wherein the status corresponds to the network device's connection state with other network devices) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37; i.e., the topographical model representing the network devices is associated with a local area network) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2; i.e., database manager manages storage and retrieval of configuration data, even logs, statistics, history, and current state information), but does not specifically teach the first color represents a

cross-connection not yet set to a network element. Tonelli et al. teaches a cross-connection not yet set to a network element (col. 9, lines 10 – 12; i.e., the cross-connection not yet set to a network device corresponds to the user being able to drag a connection to a target device), wherein the connection line comprises a first color first color (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48; i.e., the user is able to select a Customize Media option 388 to modify the current color of a line media, wherein those skilled in the art will appreciate that the connection line must have a predetermined first color before being connected to a device within the GUI in order for the user to visually identify the connector). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. with the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. because the user is given an option to select a menu to view or modify the current media line colors and patterns (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48; i.e., the menu allows the user to select or modify a line color, which further assists the user to visually identify the connection between devices).

As to **dependent claim 11**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31), a first color representing a cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2), but does not specifically mention the first color is a predetermined set color. However, in the same field of endeavor, Tonelli et al. teaches the first connection is a predetermined color (i.e., black), wherein the first color can be modified to a desired users choice (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48; i.e., the user is able to select a Customize Media option 388 to modify the current color of a line media, wherein those skilled in the art will appreciate that the connection line must have a predetermined first color before being connected to a device within the GUI in order for the user

to visually identify the connector, such as the color black). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. with the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. because the user is given an option to select a menu to view or modify the current media line colors and patterns (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48; i.e., the menu allows the user to select or modify a line color, which further assists the user to visually identify the connection between devices).

9. **Claims 12, 13, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev et al. (Patent No. 5,559,955) in view of Tonelli et al. (Patent No. 5,831,610), and further in view of Mayo et al. (Patent No. 5,751,965).**

As to **dependent claim 12,** this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31), a first color representing a cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2). Tonelli et al. teaches a cross-connection not yet set to a network element (col. 9, lines 10 – 12), wherein the connection line comprises a first color first color (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48). Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention a second color representing an active connection. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a second color representing an active connection (see e.g., Fig. 6 and col. 6, lines 60 – 65; i.e., five condition for connections are depicted as good, bad, unknown, disabled, and unreachable, wherein good represents an active connection). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as

modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the second color representing an active connection of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

As to **dependent claim 13**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 12 as previously discussed above. Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention the second color is green. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a second color is green (see e.g., Fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 36 – 50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the second color representing an active connection of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

As to **dependent claim 18**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention a fifth color representing an improper disconnect state of the communication channel. Mayo et al. teaches a fifth color (see e.g., Fig. 6) representing an improper disconnect of the communication channel (see e.g., col. 7, lines 20 – 29; i.e., the improper disconnect of a communication channel corresponds to a situation that would cause a decrease in data flow between two network devices, such as ports being purposely or accidentally disabled). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management

system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the fifth color representing an improper disconnect state of the communication channel of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

As to **dependent claim 19,** this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 18 as previously discussed above. Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention the fifth color is orange. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a fifth color is orange (see e.g., Fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 65 – 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the fifth color representing an improper disconnect state of the communication channel of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

10. **Claims 14 – 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev et al. (Patent No. 5,559,955) in view of Tonelli et al. (Patent No. 5,831,610), in view of Mayo et al. (Patent No. 5,751,965), and further in view of Galou et al. (Patent No. 6,957,263).**

As to **dependent claim 14**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31), a first color representing a

cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2). Tonelli et al. teaches a cross-connection not yet set to a network element (col. 9, lines 10 – 12), wherein the connection line comprises a first color (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48). Both Dev.et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention a third color. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a third color (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the third color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).
Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Mayo et al. do not specifically mention a pending communication channel. However, in the same field of endeavor, Galou et al teaches a pending communication channel (see e.g., col. 6, lines 9 – 11; i.e., the two different states for a cross-connection in a network system is pending and active). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the third color of Mayo et al. with the pending communication channel of Galou et al. because the pending connection can be set to activate, wherein the system can be configured to check the connection for errors, and report the status to the user with an error report (see e.g., col. 10, lines 56 – 62).

As to **dependent claim 15**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 14 as previously discussed with respect to 15. Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Galou et al. do not specifically mention

the third color is gray. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a third color being grey (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the pending communication channel of Galou et al. with the third color representing a gray color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

As to **dependent claim 16**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), a plurality of network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31), a first color representing a cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2). Tonelli et al. teaches a cross-connection not yet set to a network element (col. 9, lines 10 – 12), wherein the connection line comprises a first color (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48). Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention a fourth color. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a fourth color (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the fourth color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Mayo et al. do not specifically mention a partial communication channel state. However, in the same field of endeavor, Galou et al teaches a partial communication channel state (see e.g., col. 6, lines 9 – 11; i.e., the two different states for a cross-connection in a network system is partial, pending and active). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the fourth color of Mayo et al. with the partial communication channel state of Galou et al. because the connection can be user activated or deactivated to change the state of the cross connection from a pending or a partial state to an activate state (see e.g., col. 6, lines 56 – 60).

As to **dependent claim 17**, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 16 as previously discussed. Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Galou et al. do not specifically mention the fourth color is red. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a fourth color being red (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the partial communication channel state of Galou et al. with the fourth color representing a red color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

As to **dependent claim 20,** this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above. Dev et al. teaches a GUI (user interface 10 – see e.g., col. 3, lines 52 – 54), a plurality of

network element objects (see e.g., Fig. 8A and col. 5, lines 29 – 31), a first color representing a cross-connection (see e.g., col. 14, lines 56 – 58) locally (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 37) in a management system database (see e.g., col. 3, lines 66 – 67, and col. 4, lines 1 – 2). Tonelli et al. teaches a cross-connection not yet set to a network element (col. 9, lines 10 – 12), wherein the connection line comprises a first color (see e.g., col. 17, lines 46 – 48). Both Dev et al. and Tonelli et al. do not specifically mention a sixth color. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a sixth color (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. with the sixth color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Mayo et al. do not specifically mention an "intent to delete" state of the communications channel. However, in the same field of endeavor, Galou et al teaches an "intent to delete" state of the communications channel (see e.g., col. 6, lines 59 – 60; i.e., the intent to delete corresponds to delete step 310, wherein any connection can be deleted or detached). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the sixth color of Mayo et al. with the an "intent to delete" state of the communications channel of Galou et al. because the cross connections associated with the connection will be deleted only from the network elements in the connection's route and not form the connection itself (see e.g., col. 15, lines 21 – 30).

As to **dependent claim 21,** this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 20 as previously discussed. Dev et al., Tonelli et al., and Galou et al. do not specifically mention the sixth color is magenta. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mayo et al. teaches a fourth color (see e.g., Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the GUI, a plurality of network element objects, a first color representing a cross-connection, locally in a management system database of Dev et al. as modified by the first color representing a cross-connection not yet set to a network element of Tonelli et al. as further modified by the partial communication channel state of Galou et al. with the sixth color of Mayo et al. because representing a connection line having a color which the user may easily associate with a particular condition will allow the user immediately and intuitively understand the condition of a network without performing further inquiries (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 50).

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12. Applicant's arguments filed 03/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument of claim 6 that Dev does not teach the features of claim 6

Applicant's argument that the prior art of Dev does not teach the features of claim 6 because the applicant interprets the Dev as not teaching the selection of an icon to be used in a circuit and that the adding new devices to the network does not constitute provisioning (See arguments page 8, bottom and page 9, top).

The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner refers to MPEP 2123 that states that a reference is relied upon for all that it contains as well as what is suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. The entire reference is disclosed, not just the cited sections. Dev teaches a function where icon managers and view of **new network** elements to the network system (See column 13, lines 31-60 and column 15, lines 27-36). If an icon manager is assigned to the view of a network of elements then the teachings support the notion that a user can select an icon to be used in a circuit because the user is creating the new views (See column 16, lines 24-45). It is also noted that the icons of Dev provide multi-function information and clicking on different parts of the icon provides different information (See column 15, lines 1-10). Specifically, the Icons of Dev have a background color that represents the status of the device (See column 13, lines 1-5 and column 14, lines 53-61). Dev teaches that the network elements represent entities on the network (See column 10, lines 25-30). Dev discloses a bridge object as shown in figure 8a (router) that maintains a cross connect between other networks in the company. Therefore, the prior of Dev is interpreted as teaching all of the elements of claim 6.

Applicants arguments for claims 10-11, 12-21

Applicant's argue that the prior art of Dev does not teach the limitations of claim 6 and therefore the references applied to claims 10-11 and 12-21 do not provide the missing limitations (See arguments page 10-11).

The Examiner disagrees.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, the 103(a) rejections are based on the combinations of Dev in view Tonelli, Dev in view Tonelli in further view of Mayo, and Dev in view Tonelli, in view of mayo and in further view of Galou and the applicant has provided no arguments or evidence as to why the proposed combination of the aforementioned references cannot teach the limitations of the claims. It is true that the rejections are based on

dependent claims and if the argument for claim 6 were to hold then these arguments would be moot. However, if the argument were not to hold then the applicant has provided no arguments as to why the limitations of claim 6 inherited in the dependent claims is not taught by the combination of references. Therefore, the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER